

REMARKS

Claim 1-11 are pending

Claims 1-11 are rejected.

Claim 1 is amended to more clearly specify the operations between a controller device and a controlled device. Specifically, the AV connection is terminated by a controlled device autonomously, when a second controlled device leaves the AV connection. The termination of the AV connection by the controlled device is performed without the interference or intervention of a controller device (which was used to set up the AV connection). Support for this amendment is found in the specification on page 3, lines 5-15, page 4, lines 9-24, page 11, lines 16-31, and in other places.

Claim 7 is amended to claim that the operation of the controlled device terminating an AV connection is performed without the operation of a control point device. Support for this amendment is found in the specification on page 3, lines 5-12, page 4, lines 9-24, page 11, lines 16-31, and in other places.

No new matter was added in view of these amendments.

Rejection of Claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cheng (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/005130). Applicants disagree with this ground of rejection.

Claim 1 claims within a network, two different types of stations exist in the network. The first type of station called a control device performs the acts of, “initiating, controlling and removing” AV connections. The other type of station called a controlled device is an “AV server device” and/or “an AV rendering device”, where the AV connections between controlled devices are controlled via the control device.

Claim 1 then claims the elements of having one of the controlled devices monitor the AV connection between the device itself and a second device where “a second device from said at least two controlled devices which is AV connected to said first controlled device has sent a logging-off message.....is detected, said first controlled device autonomously ends, without an operation from said at least one control device, the AV connection with said second controlled device.” That is, where a control device typically establishes and breaks down an AV connection (as known in UPnP) the invention of Claim 1 has a controlled device monitor an AV connection and terminate such an AV connect when a “logging-off” invention is detected. Hence, part of the operation of the network is moved from the control device to the controlled device.

Cheng does not disclose or suggest these claimed elements. In regards to the terminology of Cheng, the operations of device management are performed by path manager module 330 and path database 335 correspond to the operation of the control device of Claim 1 (see Fig. 3 and paragraph 60 of Cheng). The operation of the controlled devices of Claim 1 would be akin to the device resources of Cheng (see paragraph 29).

Cheng indicates that the operations of managing network resource and drive connections are handled by the path manager 330, where the creation and teardown of a connection is performed by the path manager 330 i.e., the control device. The operation of Claim 1 however is different than what is disclosed in Cheng, in that in a very limited case, “a second device from said at least two controlled devices which is AV connected to said first controlled device has sent a logging-off message.....is detected, said first controlled device autonomously ends, without an operation from said at least one control device, the AV connection with said second controlled device”. That is, the AV connection between two controlled devices is terminated by a controlled device versus what is disclosed in paragraph 63 of Cheng where an AV connection can only be torn down by a controller device (not a controlled device as in Claim 1 which would correspond to a device resource in Cheng). Additionally, Cheng does not disclose that a device resource (a first controlled device) monitors for a

“logging-off” message from a second device resource (second controlled device). In Cheng, these functions are monitored by the path manager module (see paragraphs 60-63).

Applicants also assert that Claim 7 is patentable for the same reasons as Claim 1, where the claimed controlled device performs the claimed monitoring for “a logging-off message” and has a “connection ending means for autonomously ending the AV connection...where said connection ending means operates without the use of a control point device”. This is unlike the operation of Cheng where the controller device performs all of these functions, not the controlled device which is limited in the scope of operation of what it performs.

For the reasons given above, Applicants assert that Claims 1 and 7 are patentable over the cited art of record. Applicants also assert that Claims 2-6 and Claim 8-11 are allowable, as such claims dependent on allowable Claims 1 and 7, respectively. Applicants request the removal of the rejection to all of the pending claims.

Having fully addressed the Examiner’s rejections, it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant’s attorney at the phone number below, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,
Ingo Hutter

By: /Joel M. Fogelson/
Joel M. Fogelson
Reg. No. 43,613
Tel. No. (609) 734-6809

Serial No. 10/531,775

PD020097

Customer No. 24498

Thomson Licensing, LLC
Patent Operations
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312
May 28, 2008